

To: Ted Kaczynski  
From: R. Bonnie

**context+**  
M E D I A

December 21, 1998

Theodore J. Kaczynski  
04475-046  
P.O. Box 8500  
Florence, CO 81226-8500

Dear Ted,

Thank you for your letter of December 14, which arrived today.

I hope that Bonnie has reported the conversation we had about *60 Minutes* last week. My impression is that he may not have, since he is busy with the motion, so I will. After meeting a second time with Vicki Gordon to discuss the possibility of doing a segment about Mello's book and the issues surrounding it, I came to the conclusion that there was nothing more to discuss with her (since she wants information that I cannot supply). I told Bonnie that I thought it best to wait this out for a month or so, to see what everybody (you, Bonnie, Mello, me) thought about the possibility of doing something with that program.

I realized, a few days too late, that you might feel this to be an unwelcome barrage, which is evidenced by the fact that you ended your letter by telling me that you are angry. I can only say that I saw it coming, and I have asked Mello to "back off" and give the topic a rest for a while, which he then agreed was the best thing to do. I have told Vicki Gordon that there is nothing to discuss until sometime around the end of January, which is pretty much what you suggested in the letter I received today.

I guessed that you might say something along the lines of what you wrote in paragraph 3. When I met with *60 Minutes*, I said it was conceivable that you might agree to an interview if you had complete power to review and approve the contents of any segment they aired containing interviews with you. When I asked if they would be willing to give you that power, Gordon said that it was unlikely. I then asked if they would agree to a "script", in which they formulated three questions (that were provided to you and Bonnie beforehand), this was met with a less adamant sort of doubt. I then suggested that we take a hiatus and discuss the matter at a later date.

I hope you understand that, as far as I know (having seen nothing of your correspondence regarding Michael's book), that the manuscript Mello sent down was edited according to your requests. I can neither affirm nor deny the reality of this, since I do not know when the correspondence took place. Having said this, *60 Minutes*, has more integrity than any corps of reporters (for what that's worth) and I do not think they will pass on any information that is

contained in Mello's book. As a matter of fact, they can be sued for doing it, so I think it is rather unlikely. What is more, they do want to work with you, so it would not be in their interest to screw you (yet). That last parenthetical remark is why I asked for a hiatus.

As for your request that certain material be removed from Mello's book subject to Bonnie's review, I can only point out the injustice of that request. Mello has already demonstrated that he is willing to make changes and effect deletions to citations per your requests. So, I have a hard time understanding the preventative measure that you have effected. Consider, for a moment, Mello's support for you and the care that he has taken to ensure that your motion is successful. The request is also problematic because, in January, it will be too late to reincorporate anything. I need to get review galleys out to the booksellers and pre-publication critics. I cannot imagine Bonnie's review would require much more than a week or so, for which I can wait. As I was proofreading this letter, Mello faxed a copy of his letter to you. There is a little wiggle room around the deadline I have set for him.

I will not request a copy of Alston Chase's manuscript from Viking. My offer was made in an effort to be helpful to you, as was my investigation of the Waits book. I have informed no one of your correspondence with Alston Chase. I cannot imagine a situation that would warrant it.

As you know from my last letters, I am no longer in a rush to publish your book. I had thought this was something you desired, and was doing everything to make that happen. Please understand that it takes longer than two or three months to publish a book properly, and that printing a book is not the same thing as publishing it. Many things need to be coordinated: designers, printers, printed reviews in publications such as *Library Journal* and *Publisher's Weekly* (two industry magazines used by booksellers). A book *can* be published in as little as a month and a half (a week if you have the resources of Time Life). But this is costly (anywhere between 100 and 1000% more, depending on publicity needs) and it should not be necessary. I am awaiting further news regarding the book from you and Bonnie. As I said, there is no rush.

I asked Bonnie if he would have time to look over the contract, and he begged off. It may be that he knows a firm that can look at it for you *pro bono*. I do know that he found a firm to consider the Waits question on that basis.

Thank you for getting back to me regarding the serialization question. The profits you mention are minimal, and help to defray some of the costs of production. The practice of licensing a first serial is standard. It is how readers come to know about a book ("publish" = "to make known"). I do not pretend to understand your apparent indifference to sales, since the more readers you garner, the more people will come to understand that you have been grossly misrepresented. This may lead them to a further revelation as to the historical ramifications of *Truth versus Lies*, and the larger picture of the issues surrounding your trial, the public understanding of the Unabomber, *et al*.

My best,

Ben.

cc: Richard Bonnie